For the Northern District of California

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7		
8	FOR THE NORTHERN	N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9		
10	CHENG I. CHENG,	No. C 06-2217 WHA (PR)
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS TO
12	v.	FILE RESPONSE; DENIAL OF MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
13	Deputy AMMERMAN, # D652; Deputy ROBERT ROSENMILY; Deputy	OF COUNSEL
14	O'DELL, # D670; Deputy AĎAM	
15	JOHNSON, # D691; Ŝergeant PAT McTAGGART; Sheriff DON HORSLEY;	
16	NORMELEE TILLMAN, Director of Correctional Health Services; REBECCA	
17	ANDERSON POTTS, Medical Manager, San Mateo County Jail; EMERGENCY	
18	RESPONSE TEAM, San Mateo County Jail; COUNTY OF SAN MATEO; and	
19	DOES I-V,	
20	Defendants.	
21		
22	This is a civil rights case filed pro se by a state prisoner. Plaintiff moves for a	
23	restraining order against retaliatory assaults upon him by correctional officers at the jail. Ir	

restraining order against retaliatory assaults upon him by correctional officers at the jail. In view of his allegation that he was violently assaulted on December 8th and 9th, 2006, causing him to be hospitalized in a coma for six days, a response from defendants would assist the Court. Defendants shall file a response within fourteen days of the date this order is entered.

Plaintiff also moves for appointment of counsel. There is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case, Lassiter v. Dep't of Social Services, 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981), but 28

U.S.C. § 1915 confers on a district court the power to "request" that counsel represent a litigant		
who is proceeding in forma pauperis. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). This does not give the courts the		
power to make "coercive appointments of counsel." Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490		
U.S. 296, 310 (1989). In short, the Court has only the power to ask pro bono counsel to		
represent plaintiff, not the power to "appoint" counsel.		
Plaintiff is capable of presenting his claims effectively, and the issues, at least at this		
stage, are not complex. The motion (document number 28 on the docket) is DENIED .		
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
Dated: August 27 , 2007. WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		